| 1  | TH Law Office of Suzanne Lee Elliott  | E HONORABLE SHARON L. GLEASON  |
|----|---|--|
| 2  | Suite 1300 Hoge<br>705 Second Ave.  |  |
| 3  | Seattle WA 98104  |  |
| 4  | Suzanne-elliott@msn.com<br>206-623-0291   |  |
| 5  |   |  |
| 6  |   |  |
| 7  |   |  |
| 8  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT<br>FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA  |  |
| 9  |   |  |
| 10 | UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,   | No. 16-00086   |
| 11 | Plaintiff,  | MOTION TO PROHIBIT THE<br>ANCHORAGE CORRECTIONAL   |
| 12 | VS.   | COMPLEX FROM VIDEOTAPING CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEY CLIENT  |
| 13 | JOHN PEARL SMITH, II,   | AND DEFENSE TEAM VISITS WITH THE CLIENT  |
| 14 | Defendant.  | THE CLIENT   |
| 15 |   |  |
| 16 | I. MOTION   |  |
| 17 | Comes now the defendant John Pea  | rl Smith II and moves to immediately prohibit  |
| 18 | Comes now the defendant John Pearl Smith, II and moves to immediately prohibit  |  |
| 19 | the videotape or audiotaping of defense team meetings between John Pearl Smith, II and any members of the defense team during visits at the Anchorage Correctional Complex. |  |
| 20 |   |  |
| 21 | II. GROUNDS FOR THIS REQUEST  |  |
| 22 | On information and belief, based up   | oon the docket in <i>United States v. Kit Kjarala</i> ,  |
| 23 | 18 CR 00072 and other public information, the defense believes that that Anchorage  |  |
| 24 | Correctional Complex West has been videotaping - and perhaps audiotaping - meetings   |  |
| 25 | between John Pearl Smith, II and members<br>MOTION TO PROHIBIT AUDIO AND<br>VIDEOTAPING BETWEEN SMITH AND HIS<br>DEFENSE TEAM - 1   | of his defense team. Smith is seeking additional  LAW OFFICE OF SUZANNE LEE ELLIOTT  1300 Hoge Building  705 Second August |

Case 3:16-cr-00086-SLG Document 241 Filed 12/06/18x (206) 623-0291 U.S. V. SMITH, NO. 3:16-CR-0086-SLG-DMS

1 discovery regarding these matters. However, because counsel has some information that 2 3 4 5 6 7 motions once further discovery is completed. 8 Smith was arrested on June 22, 2016 and jailed at the Anchorage Correctional 9 10 11 12 West ever since June 2016. 13 14 15 16 17 18 visits with his defense team. 19 20 21 22

audiotaping did occur during attorney client visits in 2016 and some information that the videotaping continues<sup>1</sup>, and because his defense team must continue to meet with Mr. Smith, he asks for an immediate order prohibiting any video or audiotaping of visits (to the extent that is occurring) between Smith and any member of his defense team including investigators, mitigation specialists and other professionals. Smith may bring further

Complex West. He was arraigned, and counsel was appointed on June 29, 2016. Second counsel was appointed in September 2016. Counsel, investigators and other members of the defense team have been meeting with Smith the Anchorage Correctional Complex

Counsel has reasonable, reliable information to believe that up until at least November 1, 2016, the Anchorage Correctional Complex West had the ability to - and did - audio record meetings between counsel and clients in at least one visiting room in the jail. Counsel also has reasonable, reliable information that at all times since Mr. Smith has been incarcerated, the Anchorage Correctional Complex West has videotaped some or all of his

A defendant's unfettered and private ability to consult with counsel is essential to secure the fundamental right to due process and the protections of the Sixth Amendment. Strickland v. Washington, 466 668, 684-85. See also, Mangiaracina v. Penzone, 849 F.3d 1191, 1198 (9th Cir. 2017). Conferences between counsel and the defendant are within the

23

24

25

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Current Alaska DOC policy states only that the institution may not monitor conversations between an attorney and client "without a prior court order." Policy 808.01.VII(3)(b).

| 1  | scope of the attorney-client privilege, the oldest of the privileges for confidential                 |
|----|---|
| 2  | communications known to the common law. Upjohn Co. v. United States, 449 U.S. 383,                    |
| 3  | 389 (1981). The attorney-client privilege extends to confidential disclosures by a client to          |
| 4  | an attorney made in order to obtain legal assistance. Fisher v. United States, 425 U.S. 391,          |
| 5  | 402 (1976). It also extends to "at least those attorneys to client communications which               |
| 6  | would have tendency to reveal the confidences of the client." In re Grand Jury                        |
| 7  | Proceedings, 616 F. 3rd 1172, 1182) (10th Cir. 2010).   |
| 8  | Any conduct by the Government in eavesdropping upon the private consultations                         |
| 9  | between the defendant and his attorney would deprive him of its right to effective counsel,           |
| 10 | State v. Cory, 62 Wash. 2d 371, 378, 382 P.2d 1019, 1023 (1963).                                      |
| 11 | The same is true with visual monitoring. In Case v. Andrews, 226 Kan. 786 (Kan.                       |
| 12 | 1979), the Kansas Supreme Court held that the Lyon County jail policy of visually                     |
| 13 | monitoring all consultations between attorneys and clients is an unreasonable interference            |
| 14 | with the right to confidential attorney-client communications. The confidentiality of                 |
| 15 | communications between an attorney and his client should be carefully protected by the                |
| 16 | courts. Id. at 790. Because "absent a showing of any risk to the order or security of the jail        |
| 17 | the practice of visually monitoring an attorney-client conference when privacy is                     |
| 18 | requested, is unreasonable. Such unreasonable interference violates an accused's Sixth                |
| 19 | Amendment right to effective representation by counsel." <i>Id.</i> at 791. See also <i>State v</i> . |
| 20 | Walker, 804 N.W.2d 284, 295 (Iowa 2011) ("in the absence of any individualized showing                |
| 21 | of a safety or security risk video surveillance violates an arrestee's right to 'see and consult      |
| 22 | confidentially' with his attorney 'alone and in private.'"); People v. Dehmer, 931 P.2d 460           |
| 23 | 463 (Colo.App. 1996)(finding the prison's policy of videotaping attorney-client                       |
| 24 | conferences was unlawful); State v. Sherwood, 174 Vt. 27, 800 A.2d 463, 466 (2002)                    |
| 25 | MOTION TO PROJUDIT AUDIO AND  |

| - 1 | 1  |
|-----|--|
| 1   | ("The tape itself is evidence that defendant's conversation with counsel was not, in fact,   |
| 2   | private."). <sup>2</sup>   |
| 3   | IV. CONCLUSION   |
| 4   |  |
| 5   | Based upon the above, the defendant respectfully requests that this Court to order   |
| 6   | the Anchorage Correctional Complex West to immediately cease any audio or videotaping  |
| 7   | of defense team visits with Mr. Smith.  DATED this 6th day of December 2018.   |
| 8   | /s/Suzanne Lee Elliott   |
| 9   | Law Office of Suzanne Lee Elliott 1300 Hoge Building   |
| 10  | 705 Second Avenue  |
| 11  | Seattle, Washington 98104<br>Phone (206) 623-0291  |
| 1   | Fax (206) 623-2186   |
| 12  | Email: Suzanne-elliott@msn.com   |
| 13  | /s/Steven Wells  |
| 14  | Attorney at law  |
| 14  | 431 West 7 <sup>th</sup> Ave.  |
| 15  | Suite 107  |
|     | Anchorage, AK 99501  |
| 16  | /s/Mark Larranaga  |
| 17  | Walsh and Larranaga  |
|     | 705 Second Ave.  |
| 18  | Suite 501  |
| 19  | Seattle WA 98104   |
| 20  |  |
| 21  | CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE   |
| 22  |  |
|     | <sup>2</sup> A recent law review article summarizes the law and issues surrounding improper intrusions into the  |
| 23  | attorney-client relationship in the prison setting, including litigation concerning this issue in <i>United States v</i> .   |
| 24  | Black, 2:16-cr-20032-JAR, Kansas. Peter A. Joy & Kevin C. McMunigal, When Does Monitoring Defendants and Their Lawyers Cross the Line?, Crim. Just., Winter 2017, at 46. |
| ,   |  |

MOTION TO PROHIBIT AUDIO AND VIDEOTAPING BETWEEN SMITH AND HIS

LAW OFFICE OF SUZANNE LEE ELLIOTT 1300 Hoge Building

| 1  | I, SUZANNE LEE ELLIOTT, certify that on December 6th, 2018, I filed the           |
|----|---|
| 2  | foregoing document with the United States District Court's Electronic Case Filing |
| 3  | (CM/ECF) system, which will serve one copy by email on Assistant United States    |
| 4  | Attorneys FRANK V. RUSSO, WILLIAM A. TAYLOR, JAMES NELSON AND                     |
| 5  | KAREN VANDERGAW.  |
| 6  |   |
| 7  | /s/ Suzanne Lee Elliott Law Office of Suzanne Lee Elliott                         |
| 8  | 1300 Hoge Building<br>705 Second Avenue   |
| 9  | Seattle, Washington 98104   |
| 10 | Phone: (206) 623-0291<br>Fax: (206) 623-2186                                      |
| 11 | Email: suzanne-elliott@msn.com  |
| 12 |   |
| 13 |   |
| 14 |   |
| 15 |   |
| 16 |   |
| 17 |   |
| 18 |   |
| 19 |   |
| 20 |   |
| 21 |   |
| 22 |   |
| 23 |   |
| 24 |   |
| 25 | MOTION TO PROMIBIT AUDIO AND  |